



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,547	08/04/2006	Roberto Valli	02792	6025
987 7590 11/13/2008 SALTER & MICHAELSON THE HERITAGE BUILDING 321 SOUTH MAIN STREET PROVIDENCE, RI 029037128			EXAMINER MILLIKIN, ANDREW R	
			ART UNIT 2837	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/553,547

**Applicant(s)**

VALLI ET AL.

**Examiner**

ANDREW R. MILLIKIN

**Art Unit**

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-8 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-8,13 and 18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The concept of "overtones" and the concept of using a control module to allow "to teach the tone modification device" were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
3. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The concept of "overtones" and the concept of using a control module to allow "to teach the tone modification device" were not described in the specification in

such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 14-17 & 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 14-17: In claim 14, lines 3-4 are incomprehensible: "the tone control device receiving the key actuation signals from the sensors using, respectively combining the sensor data signal in order to select data from the tone sample memory, and wherein limited to the sensor data signals of the actuated key..." In particular, the phrase "using, respectively," the phrase "combining the sensor data signal," and the phrase "and wherein limited to the sensor data" render the claim unclear.

7. Claims 19-20: In claim 19, it is unclear what is meant by an "overtone" or "a control module allowing to teach the tone modification device." Specifically, the term "overtone" does not appear to be mentioned in the specification, and the claim appears to refer to "fractions" of overtones as being "the tone building process" and "the tone decay process," which is contrary to the commonly understood meaning of the word "overtone." Further, since the specification does not refer to the control module as allowing "to teach" the tone modification device anything, it is unclear what is meant by

the word "teach" and the phrase "allowing to teach" in the context of the claim. It is further noted that "data" appears to be misspelled as "date" in line 4.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 13 & 18 are allowed.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not fairly teach or suggest a piano with strings and a sound board, a sensor for detecting actuation of an associated key, and a delivery device including a drive means for delivering additional vibration energy into the sound board. In the prior art, vibrations were detected in order to generate further vibrations to be injected into the sound board. The prior art does not contemplate detecting actuation of particular keys in order supply the sound board with additional vibration energy. Though Nozaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,247,129, hereafter '129) does teach detecting actuation of particular keys in order to supply a sound board with vibration energy, '129 is intended for use with a stringless piano. Since '129 is directed to generating the sounds identical to those of an acoustic piano in a stringless piano (col. 14, lines 18-23), using such technology along with technology intended to augment the sound of an acoustic piano (such as that of '586) would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made. Essentially, the prior art of record does not fairly teach or suggest the concept of using a drive means to supply additional vibration energy to the sound board of a piano based on individual key movement signals.

10. Claims 14-17 & 19-20 would most likely be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 9 July 2008, with respect to claims 2-3 & 6-8 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 2-3 & 6-8 has been withdrawn.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW R. MILLIKIN whose telephone number is (571)270-1265. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 7:30-5 and 7:30-4 Alternating Fridays (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Benson can be reached on 571-272-2227. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew R. Millikin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2837

/Walter Benson/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2837